

The Washington Times

THE NATIONAL DAILY

Reg. U. S. Patent Office.
ARTHUR BRISBANE, Editor and Owner.
EDGAR D. SHAW, Publisher.
Entered as second class matter at the Postoffice at Washington, D. C.
Published Every Evening (including Sundays) by
The Washington Times Company, Munsey Bldg., Pennsylvania Ave.
Mail Subscriptions: 1 year (Inc. Sundays), \$7.50; 3 Months, \$1.95; 1 Month, 65c.
SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1919.

It Takes Both Parents to Wheel
This Baby

National Problems Require National Intelligence for
Their Best Solution, and That Takes in ALL the People.



THE SOLUTION.—From The London World.

This picture from the London World, like all good pictures, tells its story better than words could do it.

The baby might have been more comprehensively named, for there are more problems than National Debt that face Labor and Capital alike.

All kinds of national burdens have grown beyond any pre-war imagination. The debt will not pay itself. The burdens are not self-supporting.

Capital cannot by itself pay one any more than Labor can all alone bear the others. Each must do its share. Each must recognize its responsibilities and acknowledge itself accountable.

If one pulls and the other pushes progress will be retarded, even if retrogression is avoided.

Each has rights which the other must recognize. Each has powers which the other must confess.

The easiest way, the best way, the most profitable way, is for Capital and Labor to attempt all tasks together, each holding the other in proper recognition and respect.

The time when Capital was king has gone by, and there is no more right or reason in an autocracy of Labor than in any other form of monarchy.

Capital and Labor are both subjects, not rulers. The law is the only king, and then only by the will of those it rules.

The national burdens must be borne by all together. The national problems must be solved by an intelligence which results from united minds. The task is big enough and difficult enough for the associated effort of everybody.

From The Public To The Editor

Pay For Soldiers.

To the Editor of THE TIMES:

Dear Sir: Your editorial in September 18 edition of Washington Times in regard to the "bonus for soldiers" has caused considerable comment among a number of the soldiers.

"We surely appreciate the fact that some editors are backing these measures which mean so much to those of us who have left all in a cause which we believed right and worthy of our strongest support."

Under present living conditions our \$1000 bonus would not last long while we were "settling up" again, besides our environment has so changed our views that we are more or less unsettled and undecided as to our best course not only for ourselves but still—for the principles for which we've been striving but not fully attained.

True, Prussianism is downed, but so many enemies to democratic living exist in our own country which requires attention that to those who have had an "ideal" it appears our duty is yet unfinished.

Again we say as best we can that we appreciate your efforts and support.

PVT. CLARENCE RALSTON,
H. Q. Co., Twenty-six Infantry, First Division, U. S. A., Camp Meade, Md.

Our President.

To the Editor of THE TIMES:

What a feeling of gratification we enjoy when a heartfelt wish has been granted by a most merciful Providence! Only a few days ago the very foundation of our sense of feeling was appalled by learning of the dangerous condition of the Chief Magistrate of our glorious America. How readily one could discern the very pulse beat of these true sons and daughters of a peace-loving people on their way to and from their daily tasks, each of them with anxious countenance only too eager to catch a word of mouth or a line from the newspapers that would give them a ray of hope that this greatest of tireless leaders for humanity's cause was to be spared to them, that Woodrow Wilson would survive his present illness, regain his usual good health, and live to accomplish those great tasks that mean so much to the welfare of the world.

The writer has followed the won-

derful thought and action of him—the most unselfish of men—from one council group on this side of the Atlantic to the League of Nations tables in France. During all of this trying time, when all nations of the earth were groping and grasping for enlightenment on the momentous questions under discussion, their first thought was as to what Woodrow Wilson was going to say in reference to those conditions that could not be more vital to the future prosperity of the world. When all the people of the universe are waiting with bated breath a word of knowledge from one man, is it any wonder that envious tongues should rattle, that misanthropic devotion to that of this honest, freeman would seek through motives ulterior to tear down the honest foundation of such a tireless and incessant builder?

The writer's thoughts are high in his estimation of the honest judgment of the American people and certainly they will not allow this great man's work to go unrewarded like that of our great liberator, Abraham Lincoln, only to see the wonderful light of his unselfish devotion to the cause of humanity fifty years after this great combination of human force and honest endeavor has been gathered to his fathers.

R. E. S.

Visit the Museum.

To the Editor of THE TIMES:
In a previous issue you mentioned the fact that if you went to the National Museum, that the Hicks all go and if about 95 per cent more of the Washingtonians would visit the museum they would learn a lot of things. It would also be a very good idea if the members of the Senate and Congress would pay an occasional visit to the museum. Probably half of the members do not know where it is situated. The museum has on exhibition not only a vast amount of historical exhibits, but about the first of everything that was invented or used in the United States—the first printing press (Ben Franklin's own), first railroad engine, sewing machine, telephone, typewriter, and first vehicle propelled by gasoline—coins, postage stamps, and paper money.

DOUGLAS N. STARR.

While We Rock the Boat



Beatrice Fairfax Writes of the Problems and Pitfalls of the War Workers
Especially For Washington Women

This Young Man

Was Too Exclusive.

DEAR MISS FAIRFAX:

Some little while back a young man used to call quite often at my house to see me, and as he never suggested going anywhere the evenings were always spent at home, my family being of the real congenial type usually found all at home together. Upon leaving one night my friend told me he liked me very much and liked my folks, but he wasn't calling on the whole family, and as I didn't see fit to put my people to bed or send them out on the evenings this gentleman wished to call I haven't seen him since.

Perhaps some of the young men who have written you recently trying to describe the different types of girls in Washington can tell me why the majority of our nice young men prefer the company of a married woman to that of a single girl. In the Bureau, where I work, every married woman who wants to go around has more engagements than she can keep. In the neighborhood where I used to live a married woman with several children whose husband was working in another city was the most popular lady on the block. She had a different young man several years her junior for every night in the week. She always went out, and if the young man didn't take her children along with them he usually provided them with money to buy candy or ice cream until their mother returned.

I often wonder why this is, does the young man calling on a girl ever suggest taking her mother or sister along just once. No, and the girl had better not suggest it, or she will likely get the same answer I got, "I am not going with the whole family."

A PLAIN GIRL.

Of course it takes all kinds of men to make up the world, but unfortunately they're not all so rude as the young man you mentioned. Still something must be said on his side of the case because a young man in love just naturally hates a crowd. The married women are probably popular for the same reason usually accredited to widows. They usually understand men better than young unmarried girls, and have learned the futility of trying to make a man play dead, lie down and roll over and jump through hoops. Therefore men are more comfortable when with them, and you can't get away from the tremendous fact that men like to get where they're comfortable and won't stay long where they're not.

Answers to Correspondents

Sweetheart as Mother

A Sorry Situation.

DEAR MISS FAIRFAX:

I care quite a lot about a young man of this city, and I think he cares a lot for me, but his mother thinks that I am too much in love with him and tries to turn him against me. She does not know me, and I believe she does not want us to go together steadily.

He told me what his mother said and it hurt my feelings very much, so I thought I would show them that I was not so deeply in love as they thought, and told him that I was not bothered so very much about him, and would not have anyone thinking that I was. He got very angry at this and will not come to see me or even call me up.

Now, I care quite a lot for him and would like very much to have his company, but do not feel it my place to call him or try in any way that I know of to get him back. I feel that he wants to come only that I hurt his feelings, and he is too proud to ask me to let him come. I am very sorry for what I have said and wish that I had not said it.

Any advice given me on this subject will be greatly appreciated.
G. R. B.

Why not wait a little while without doing anything and see if the young man does not come back of his own accord? If he does, don't again make the mistake of opposing yourself and your views against his mother's. You may be in the right, but it will be hard to convince him that you and not his mother is right.

Of course, the truth of the matter is, that few mothers want any girl to have their sons. They seldom give them up without something of a struggle. Bide your time and be more discreet.

Make Kissing Difficult

If You Want to Win.

DEAR MISS FAIRFAX:

I have been engaged to a young man for about three years, and when he leaves me in the evening I expect him to kiss me sometimes—naturally we being engaged, but he always refuses—saying some one might see us. When he calls, if there is anyone else around, he seems to think nothing of giving all his attention to the other party—whether it is a special friend of his or not. Do you think that is proof that he no longer cares as one being engaged should? I love him dearly, and he knows it.

BROKEN BLOSSOMS.

No man wants the kisses that come too easily nor wants to give the kisses that are expected of him. Somehow kisses don't come under the category of things you can demand like a transfer or expect like three meals a day. From now on, let him seek your kisses and you'll find he'll like that arrangement better. And so will you.

What Is the Mystery

In This Case?

DEAR MISS FAIRFAX:

About five years ago my husband had a letter in his pocket, and when I asked him to let me see it, he tore it up.

That made me very nervous. I let it go by and didn't say any more about it. Sometimes he would leave home and would stay for two days, and I would nearly go frantic, thinking something had happened to him. One night he said he was feeling very badly, but the next morning he went to work, and didn't return home for two days. When he did come he said he wouldn't do it again, but it is the same thing over and over again. I have been married fifteen years. My husband is forty and I am thirty-two. Every morning I tell him to be good, until 5 o'clock. We have a very pretty home, but he doesn't seem to care for it, as he is always thinking when he is at home and goes off by himself. He explains it by saying he is worrying about business. Do you think this will keep up always? MRS. M.

I think it will keep up until you put a stop to it. Any woman who submits to forty-eight hours absences without convincing explanations is either a saint or a fool. Turn over a new leaf, go about and make your husband take you to places of amusement. Most men will attempt to get away with anything as long as a wife is simple and long-suffering. No man has a right to worry any woman as he is doing. If his worries are from business cares, there is no reason why he shouldn't confide in his wife.

Thinks Landlady's Daughter

Goes With His Board.

DEAR MISS FAIRFAX:

I have noticed your advice to others and I want to ask your advice on this subject. A certain young man has been boarding at my house for nearly four years, during which time I have been keeping steady company with him. This man is lonely and honest and has a lovely disposition. He is twelve years older than I and I think a real lot of him, but I don't love him enough to marry him. But what worries me most of all is that I can't have other company because he is always around and when I do go out, he cries and feels hurt over it. I have told him I would not marry him, but still I go with him because I still like him as a friend.

If, by this time, you don't love him enough to marry him, you don't love him enough to waste any more of your life with him. You're worse off as far as being circumscribed in your actions than if you were married to him. Assert yourself, have friends call and go out when you please. The first few weeks will be the hardest. I should say he is a very expensive boarder to have at the price of your liberty. I should think a crying man would be an abomination unto any woman.

The American Standard of
Health and Decency

Dr. Meeker Writes a Letter. It Is Interesting—But I wonder How Many Congressmen Will Follow His Advice.

By EARL GODWIN.

"It is impossible for a family of average size consisting of husband, wife, and three children, to live decently and healthfully on a less income than \$2,262.47." Take that to heart, Mr. Congressman, who must vote on bills to appropriate money for Government employees. The statement is that of a great expert, Royal B. Meeker, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is in a letter to me, answering one I sent him in which I called attention to the criticism from a reader of The Times who did not quite comprehend or believe all that the Bureau of Labor Statistics said about the advance in rents in Washington.

Speaking of rents, Dr. Meeker says: "I can readily understand how one who has been stung by profiteers would maintain stoutly that all rents had been increased more than 100 per cent. On the other hand we found hundreds of people whose rents had not been increased at all because they were living in the same apartments or houses rented by them before the war, and they were protected by the Saulsbury resolution."

Anything from the Bureau of Labor Statistics is interesting, because over in that bureau they have a way of showing you the facts about everyday life in a manner much more suited to ordinary understanding than we ordinary mortals can express.

For instance, the bureau contends, and rightly, too, that the standard of American decency demands that a family of five spend at least \$2,262.42 a year for living. More power to Dr. Meeker. In his letter to me he says:

"I wish to call your attention also to the fact that the family budget worked out by the experts in the Bureau of Labor Statistics under my immediate direction, is a MINIMUM OF HEALTH AND DECENCY BUDGET. It is not a minimum of subsistence budget. In our country-wide study of cost of living we found hundreds of families living on less than \$900 a year, which means that they were living far below a minimum standard of health and decency. The fact that the families were still alive proves that they were able to exist on this substandard wage. No American worker's family should be expected to live on this substandard level. The question to be determined is what is the lowest minimum of health and decency below which no American family should be expected to live. This minimum level of health and decency for clerical employees in the Government service in Washington, D. C., the bureau has attempted to set forth tentatively. I cannot too emphatically state that the budget submitted is a MINIMUM OF HEALTH AND DECENCY BUDGET. That does not indicate that the wage or salary of experienced clerical employees in the Government service should be fixed at this bare minimum of health and decency. On the contrary it would seem that this minimum is the lowest permissible level. I say this deliberately, notwithstanding the fact that the modal salary in the Federal service is probably \$1,400, plus the \$240 bonus, making \$1,640 the salary received by the largest income group in the Federal service. At the present level of prices it is impossible for a family of average size, consisting of husband, wife, and three children, to live decently and healthfully on a less income than \$2,262.47."

HEARD AND SEEN

An ex-soldier calls to settle the coal strike by putting the mines "all the slackers, draft dodgers and aliens who canceled their first papers, and, in general, all the kid-glove boys and pussy-footers." If they can't mine coal any better than they could fight, I guess I prefer the strike.

Keep up this weather and we don't care whether there is a coal strike or not.

Well, Prince Leopold DID meet some American girls—notwithstanding official statements to the contrary.

I saw him dining at the St. Marks, and in the party were Miss Nancy Lane, Miss Adams, daughter of Horace H. Adams, of Houston, Tex.; Franklin K. Lane, Jr., and several others.

Which, if I may be so bold, is probably the BEST time he had during his entire stay.

"November" First. Walk! Walk! Walk, and take the air. Be a Pedestrian. And NOT a Passen-gaire. Show your disapproval of The seven-cent fare. And walk your way to business Via Old Shanks' Mare.

The above is awful stuff, but how much "awfuler" is that seven-cent fare, twice a day for seven days—every week—"ad infinitum." And to think that naturalists say the "dodo" is extinct! Why this beautiful city of ours is full of 'em. And that other bird (or fish, rather) of which they say "one is born every minute," wrong again, as far as Washington is concerned. They get "borned" here one dozen per minute—a baker's dozen at that. ONE OF 'EM.

Always Glad To Boost a Struggling Publication.

J. E. FERREE, 707 20th street n. w., asks me to call attention to a good article in Saturday Evening Post of October 11, "The Bookish Budget," which he thinks will help a lot of people solve the High Cost of Living.

"It is not the dry type of story," says Mr. Ferree, "but an honest to goodness story with a real object in view."

Can't you use your influence with some of these clothing dealers to have vests made that will MEET THE TROUSERS IN THE BACK? L. GROUCHEAU.

Lines to Keep in Type. "Prompt action is anticipated in the Senate."

"The exact time for consideration by the Senate has not, however, been determined."

Protests Against Arresting Lunch Venders

able to the average employee of the Government department.

"The Federal Government, from the President down, is bent upon reducing the cost of living. The District officials are, no doubt, equally concerned, and will give attention to the appeal of the citizen."

"The appeal is to let these various lunch concerns, selling lunches in front of the Government department buildings, and in that way help the employes from being pressed to patronize the cafes and restaurants, which charge such enormous prices, which the employes cannot afford to pay."

"We, the undersigned, thank you for considering this appeal, which if met by your approval will mean a benefit to us, as employes of the Federal Government."